EC 012 488

A STUDY OF TWO TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS FOR COUNSELOR TRAINING.
FINAL REPORT.
BY- BLOCHER, DONALD H.
MINNESOTA UNIV., MINNEAPOLIS
CONTRACT OEC-5-10-424
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$ P.
50   2.56

DESCRIPTORS- *COUNSELOR TRAINING, STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS,
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, RESEARCH PROJECTS, TABLES (DATA),
PROGRAM EVALUATION, *INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS, *TIME FACTORS
(LEARNING), PREDICTIVE VALIDITY, ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, RATING
SCALES, *BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, INTERVIEW RATING SCALES,
MINNEAPOLIS

TWO TYPES OF COUNSELING PROGRAMS WERE COMPARED BY RANDOM
ASSIGNMENT OF 30 COUNSELORS TO TWO PRACTICUM TREATMENTS.
FIFTEEN COUNSELORS RECEIVED 60 HOURS OF COUNSELING EXPERIENCE
CONCENTRATED INTO THE LAST 3 MONTHS OF A YEAR-LONG TRAINING
PROGRAM. ANOTHER 15 RECEIVED 60 HOURS DISTRIBUTED IN THE LAST
6 MONTHS. SUPERVISING STAFF AND METHODS OF INSTRUCTION WERE
IDENTICAL FOR BOTH.. TRAINING OUTCOMES OF THE TWO TREATMENTS
WERE MEASURED USING A SET OF RATING SCALES DEVELOPED TO
MEASURE FIVE THEORETICALLY RELEVANT CONSTRUCTS OF THE
COUNSELING PROCESS, AS WELL AS OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN THE
INTERVIEW. THESE SCALES WERE FOUND TO BE USABLE WITH
INTERJUDGE RELIABILITIES OF .90. PREDICTIVE VALIDITIES FOR
PREDICTING PRACTICUM GRADE FROM PREPRACTICUM INTERVIEWS WERE
ABOUT .60. THESE RATING SCALES WERE USED TO EVALUATE 16MM
SOUND MOTION PICTURE FILMS OF COUNSELING INTERVIEWS DONE ON
COMPLETION OF PRACTICUM TREATMENTS BY BOTH GROUPS. ONE-WAY
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTS ON ALL FIVE CONSTRUCTS AND OVERALL
INTERVIEW PERFORMANCE SCORES WERE RUN FOR ALL 30 COUNSELORS.
NO TREATMENT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND BETWEEN GROUPS ON ANY OF
THE VARIABLES. ANALYSIS WAS ALSO MADE OF THE NONVERBAL
INTERVIEW BEHAVIOR OF COUNSELORS USING 17 BEHAVIOR
CATEGORIES. TEN CATEGORIES DISCRIMINATED SIGNIFICANTLY
BETWEEN HIGH- AND LOW-RATED COUNSELORS. (PS)

A STUDY OF TWO TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS
FOR COUNSELOR TRAINING

PROJECT 5 - 367

CONTRACT NO. OE 5 10 · 424

FINAL REPORT

Submitted By:

Donald H. Blocher
Associate Professor
Educational Psychology
University of Minnesota

LIST OF TABLES

A Study of Two Types of Internships For Counselor Training

The Problem

The counseling practicum has traditionally been conducted in most counselor education institutions at the end of the total program of preparation. Generally practicum has followed the completion of most if not all of the required didactic course work. The assumption though seldom made explicit, has apparently been that a mastery of didactic material must precede practicum work if maximum learning in the latter is to occur.

A number of factors suggest, however, that practicum work may profitably be integrated into the first phase of preparation. Counselor educators frequently report that students have forgotten some essential elements of didactic work, and that time must often be taken to provide review of this material. Students in the beginning and intermediate phase of didactic work often fail to see the relationship between what they are being taught in the academic classroom and what they will be doing in the practicum and on the job.

Many of the changes in behavior which are objectives of the practicum seem to be obtained as much as a function of time as in terms of the number of supervised interviews. Effective performance in the interview situation seems to be a function of the individual's ability to assimilate and integrate a considerable number of diverse techniques and approaches into a highly personalized and comfortable "counseling style" which becomes uniquely his own. It seems highly possible that this type of learning might occur as much as a function of time in practicum as in terms of number of interview trials.

From a practical administrative standpoint a number of advantages exist in an integrated, distributed practicum. Problems of the scheduling of clients, interview facilities and staff time are considerably less difficult in a distributed practicum. In many ways if the academic outcomes are equal, practical advantages would often justify the use of distributed practicum procedures.

Related Research

Virtually no published research has been directed to the problem of concentrated
versus distributed practice effects within the counseling practicum. One of the
reasons for the paucity of this type of research has been the rather primitive
nature of research techniques and the tools available for studying the nature of
the counseling process.

One of the major obstacles to research in counseling has been the absence
of generally agreed upon, operationally defined, criteria in terms of counselee
behavior. It has been necessary to attempt to evaluate counselor behavior largely
through an examination of the interview process itself.

For approximately twenty-five years various kinds of recordings of counseling
interviews have been used to investigate the nature of the counseling process.
Robinson (20) who has made a substantial contribution to this line of research
calls this a study of "the social psychology of the counseling interview." He
and others in the field have called for more thorough studies of the patterns of
communication and interaction within the interview as the key to understanding the
central dynamics which underlie both successful counseling and successful counselor
preparation.

The careful study of the counseling interview process is a vital concern in
examining the effectiveness of counselor education procedures. The effective
study of the interview, however, requires the availability of sizeable samples
of total counseling behavior as these exist in interaction with real clients.

Early studies in the area of interview process were somewhat handicapped by
limited technical facilities for studying counselor-client behavior. Kaufer (15),
for example, used verbatim transcripts which included two-minute uninterrupted
client speeches on five different questions to determine if anxiety level was
related to speech rate or speech content. He was limited to verbal behavior
by the nature of his approach and did not study the effects of counselor behavior
on the client. Moos (17) in another study analyzed tape recorded interviews for

number of speech units, independent of such units, and number of effective units. He experimented with the effects of operant conditioning techniques in influencing client behavior. His study was limited to verbal behavior.

Ellsworth (9) in a more global attempt rated counselor statements within interviews and in case conferences. The statements were analyzed on whether they were feeling, feeling and content, or content statements. The study investigated the degree of consistency between in-interview and extra-interview counselor behavior.

Hoffman (13) approached the problem of describing counselor behavior by trying to analyze objectively the nature and range of counselor sub-roles. He analyzed the patterns of verbal behavior which the counselor uses in the interview. From this he developed a set of sub-roles which describe the typical repertoire of each counselor. Campbell (3) used Hoffman's fourteen sub-roles in analyzing typescripts of counseling interviews to examine the relation of counselor personality and background on interview behavior.

Howe and Pope (14) investigated therapist's verbal activity level in interviews. They defined activity in terms of three constructs: ambiguity, lead, and inference. They then classified verbal responses objectively to define each construct operationally.

Davity and Davity (5) moved beyond the limits of verbal behavior to study the effects of non-verbal vocal cues. They rated feelings on these non-verbal vocal cues and found some evidence for a theory of non-verbal vocal communication.

Buckheimer and Carter (2) studied empathic behavior by analyzing typescripts and recordings. Behavior was analyzed in relation to component areas of tone, pace, ability to grasp the client's frame of reference, adherence to or abandonment of counselor strategy, and repertoire of leads.

Sydiaha (21) used Bules' Interaction Process Analysis to study specific behavior in the interview. Dohrenwend and Richardson (7) studied the structure of interviews. Guze and Mensh (12) analyzed some features of the interview with the Interaction Chronograph. Client behaviors were analyzed as either verbal or non-verbal in 1/100th minute units of time.

Anderson and Anderson (1), and O'Hearn and Arbuckle (18) have also reported studies analyzing counselor behavior. Danskin (4), Dipboye(6), Drasgow and Walker (8), Fiedler (10), Grigg (11), Koester (16), and Parker (19) have all reported studies which analyzed interviews in attempts to study the counseling process and relevant counseling behaviors.

Most of the studies cited above dealt only with verbal communication even though it is obvious that other types of counselor-client communication may be extremely relevant. Most of the studies dealt with rather broad constructs such as roles, empathy, content units or others which are not firmly ahchored in objective behaviors. Others dealt with quite specific and minute observations such as rate of speaking, eyeblink, etc., which are difficult to fit into a theoretical frame of reference.

Design of the Study

In the academic year 1963-64, a controlled experiment was designed to assess the differences in effectiveness between two types of practicum treatments.

Definitions

For the purposes of this study counseling practicum was defined as that portion of the counselor education program in which the trainee engages in supervised counseling interviews with actual clients. It is roughly analagous to practice teaching for teachers. Supervision was defined as (1) review and critique of tape-recorded interviews, and (2) observation and critique of interviews conducted behind a one-way vision glass.

The Population

The population of subjects for this study consisted of thirty graduate students enrolled in the counselor education program at the University of Minnesota. These students were engaged in a one year program leading to certification as secondary school counselors. Twenty-five of these counselors were male, five were female. The age range was from 24 to 38 years with a median age of 27 years. All held bachelors degrees and all had been secondary school teachers.

Experimental Design

For the purposes of the study, the total group of thirty was randomly divided into two treatment groups of fifteen members each. These groups were known as Group A the "Distributed Practicum Group" and Group B the "Concentrated Practicum Group." Both groups received exactly the same program of didactic instruction. Group A, however, received a counseling practicum distributed over a six month period, while Group B received exactly the same number of hours of practicum instruction concentrated into a three month period. Techniques of supervision were the same, the supervising staff was identical for both groups, and every effort was made to insure similar experiences except for the time factor. An elaborate schedule of practicum activities was constructed insuring that each group received a total of sixty hours of supervised work.

Measurement of Outcomes

The outcomes of the two practicum treatments were studied through the use of 16 m.m. sound motion picture films made of the actual counseling behavior of the counselors-in-training. Each counselor-in-training interviewed volunteer clients from the University High School as part of his regular practicum experience. These interviews were filmed with the knowledge and consent of both counselor and client. The motion picture camera was located behind a one-way vision mirror. Three filmed interviews were obtained from each counselor-in-training at the beginning, middle and end of practicum work. These films made the detailed analysis of both verbal and non-verbal aspects of the interview possible.

The Criterion Instrument

Filmed interviews were analyzed with the use of an instrument developed especially for this study. This instrument was developed around five theoretical constructs of counselor behavior which were frequently mentioned in the counseling literature and which were viewed to represent most adequately the objectives of the counselor education program to which the thirty counselors were exposed. These five constructs were: 1. Role Adaptation, 2. Cognitive Flexibility, 3. Consistency of Communication, 4. Perceptual Sensitivity, and 5. Interpersonal Involvement. These constructs are farther defined as follows:

Role Adaptation. In order to meet the client's needs, the counselor is often called upon to play a wide variety of roles in the interview. His success in using various roles depends upon several factors: (a) the number of roles in which he is able to engage; (b) his ability to choose the proper role at a particular point in time with a particular client; and (c) his ability to shift roles in an efficient manner as the need arises (or, conversely, to continue in his present role if there is no need to shift).

Cognitive Flexibility. The counselor is a person to whom a client comes to get a fresh and different perspective about himself and his concerns. In meeting this need the counselor responds in diverse and creative ways which reflect his "cognitive flexibility." There are three aspects to this dimension: (a) the counselor's range of psychological concepts for understanding human behavior; (b) his repertory of interview techniques within a particular role; and (c) his supply of relevant information about the client and his world.

Consistency of Communication. The counselor communicates with the client in both verbal and non-verbal ways. He sends out "signals" to the client by means of (1) what he says verbally, and (2) his voice inflection, facial expression, posture, gestures, and mannerisms. The counselor's "consistency of communication" can be ascertained by observing the degree to which his verbal and non-verbal behaviors are compatible, i.e., the extent to which they convey the same meaning.

Perceptual Sensitivity. Part of the counselor's task is to listen and comprehend what the client is communicating. Client communications vary from overt, simple verbal expressions to very subtle non-verbal communications which are expressed through changes in voice quality, facial expression, gestures, nervous mannerisms and the like.

Interpersonal Involvement. One of the counselor's assets is his ability to enter into a close, spontaneous relationship with the client. There are two main aspects to this dimension of counseling: (a) the extent to which the counselor shows a genuine feeling of acceptance and caring for the client, and (b) the extent to which the counselor reveals himself frankly and openly as one human being to another.

Construction of the Instrument

Rating scales of the Likert type were developed measuring each construct. In order to define operationally each construct in terms of counselor behaviors, however, it was also necessary to obtain a set of behavioral items to undergird the rating scale and thus to render ratings more objective.

To do this, a universe of possibly relevant counselor behaviors was assembled from a variety of sources. Supervisor critique sheets from interviews were analyzed. An intensive search of the counseling literature was made. Open-ended questionnaires completed by clients describing their interview experiences were studied.

From these sources a list of approximately 500 items was compiled. This list was then screened to eliminate items which were duplicates or which were so highly inferential in nature that they could not be objectively tallied.

The remaining 153 items were then sorted by three experienced Ph.D. counselor educators in terms of their relevance to the five constructs. One hundred twenty-two of these items were classified in the same way by all three of the counselor educators. These items were then used to define the five constructs defined above.

The resulting instrument appears in Appendix A. The judges were asked to complete both the Likert scale and the check list of objective behaviors underlying each scale. Scores on the latter were termed the "yes" responses and were scored separately to obtain a more objective measure of the construct.

Standardization of the Instrument

It was decided to use the middle set of films to refine and standardize the criterion instrument as well as to train judges. These films were viewed by three highly experienced counselor educators and several with lesser amounts of experience. During this process, major modifications were made in the scales which increased reliability. At the end of this process, it was found that the three experienced counselor educators and four of the less experienced counselor educators were able to use the scales with virtually identical results to evaluate either filmed or live counseling interviews. The latter four people were selected as judges for the remaining two sets of interviews. All of these judges had extensive counseling experience and at least one year of counselor education experience. All were in the final stages of their doctoral programs in counseling psychology.

These judges were then given intensive training in using the final form of the criterion instrument. They were trained to rate each interview on the five selected constructs and also on global effectiveness using a nine point, Likert type scale. They were also trained to tally the counselor behaviors which underlie the constructs.

These judges then proceeded to rate independently each of the remaining sixty films. Each film was rated by either two or three judges. To check for various sources of rater bias, the ratings were then analyzed using Guilford's method. Separate analyses of variance were performed to detect three principal sources of errors. These were "leniency bias," "rater-trait interaction bias," and "halo bias." Of these only halo bias proved significant. The ratings were then adjusted for halo effect.

These adjustments were found to increase interjudge reliability to a small extent.

Reliability of the Instrument

Interjudge agreement was estimated by Ebel's procedure involving reliability by the intraclass correlation. For a given set of data, e.g., ratings on Scale 1, this procedure yields two coefficients of correlation--one indicating the reliability of a single rater, and the other indicating the reliability of all raters combined. The reliabilities for each of the scales, for the cumulated points across all scales, and for the overall interview rating are given in Table 1. The reliabilities are listed separately for adjusted and unadjusted ratings. On the whole, the various reliability coefficients appear quite adequate. It will be noted that in all cases the reliabilities for the adjusted ratings are higher than those for the unadjusted rating. However, the correlations for adjusted ratings on cumulated points on scales 1-5 (with the asterisk) should be disregarded, since the method of computing the adjusted ratings insures that these correlations will be 1.00, except for rounding errors.

TABLE 1
INTERJUDGE AGREEMENT (RELIABILITY) ON UNADJUSTED
AND ADJUSTED RATINGS

Scale

	1 U	1 A	2 U	2 A	3 U	3 A	4 U	4 A	5 U	5 A	Cum-Pts. U	Cum-Pts. A	Overall U	Overall A
Single Rater	.73	.94	.72	.89	.68	.80	.68	.88	.72	.92	.77	.997*	.77	.96
All Raters Combined	.89	.98	.89	.96	.86	.92	.87	.96	.89	.97	.91	.999*	.91	.99

*Artifact of Adjusted Ratings

U = Unadjusted Ratings

A = Adjusted Ratings

Interjudge agreement on the number of "Yes" (counselor behaviors) responses assigned for each scale and across the five scales is shown in Table 2. These reliabilities are the same for both adjusted and unadjusted ratings, since no corrections were applied to the "Yes" responses.

TABLE 2
INTERJUDGE AGREEMENT (RELIABILITY) ON
NUMBER OF "YES" RESPONSES GIVEN

Scale

	1	2	3	4	5	Total on 1-5
Single Rater	.58	.71	.74	.61	.80	.76
All Raters Combined	.80	.88	.90	.82	.92	.90

Validity of the Instrument

The concurrent validity of the scales was assessed by correlating the scale ratings with three other measures of counseling success which were formulated at the same time the films were made. These are (1) the composite ranking of the trainees by the total staff, using the criterion of "overall predicted success as a counselor;" (2) the composite ranking of the trainees on this same criterion by those staff members who were involved in assigning practicum grades; and (3) grade in the practicum. The correlations between scale ratings and each of these criteria are listed in Tables 3, 4, and 5. It will be noted that the correlations between Scales 1 and 2 and both sets of rankings are significant at the .01 level, while those between Scale 4, cumulated points, and overall interview rating are significantly correlated with the same criteria at the .05 level. The correlations between the various scale ratings and practicum grade are considerably lower than those involving the rankings, with the exception of Scale 1, which remains significant at the .01 level. Scale 2 and cumulative points are still significant, but have dropped from the .01 to the .05 level.

TABLE 3
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCALE RATINGS
AND RANKING BY TOTAL STAFF

Scale

	1		2		3		4		5		Cum-Pts.		Overall	
	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A
J_1	.51**	.51**	.56**	.56**	.16	.14	.34	.32	.28	.28	.42*	.41*	.36*	.36*
J_2	.41*	.43*	.47**	.49**	.18	.21	.28	.32	.31	.33	.36*	.39*	.42*	.45*
J_3	.39*	.46*	.30	.34	.20	.22	.41*	.45*	.28	.31	.34	.40*	.38*	.43*
J_1-J_3 Combined	.48**	.48**	.48**	.48**	.20	.20	.39*	.38*	.32	.32	.40*	.40*	.42*	.42*

U = Unadjusted Ratings
A = Adjusted Ratings

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE 4
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCALE RATINGS
AND RANKING BY EVALUATORS

Scale

	1		2		3		4		5		Cum-Pts.		Overall	
	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A
J_1	.54**	.53**	.55**	.55**	.15	.13	.37*	.35	.28	.28	.43*	.42*	.38*	.37*
J_2	.45*	.46*	.48**	.49**	.19	.21	.30	.34	.32	.33	.38*	.40*	.43*	.45*
J_3	.40*	.49**	.29	.35	.24	.28	.36*	.42*	.26	.31	.34	.41*	.36*	.42*
J_1-J_3 Combined	.51**	.50**	.48**	.48**	.22	.22	.39*	.39*	.31	.31	.41*	.41*	.42*	.42*

U = Unadjusted Ratings
A = Adjusted Ratings

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE 5
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCALE RATINGS
AND PRACTICUM GRADE

Scale

	1 U	1 A	2 U	2 A	3 U	3 A	4 U	4 A	5 U	5 A	Cum-Pts. U	Cum-Pts. A	Overall U	Overall A
J₁	**.50	**.55	*.38	*.42	.11	.15	.22	.26	.20	.24	.32	*.37	.22	.26
J₂	*.40	**.47	.33	*.39	.11	.20	.15	.23	.23	.30	.26	.35	.29	*.37
J₃	*.44	*.43	*.36	.32	*.38	.31	*.40	*.36	.26	.20	*.39	*.36	*.37	.34
J₁-J₃ Combined	**.49	**.49	*.39	*.40	.23	.24	.30	.30	.25	.26	*.36	*.36	.32	.32

U = Unadjusted Ratings
A = Adjusted Ratings

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Predictive Validity. An effort to assess the predictive validity of the scales was made by correlating the first set or pre-practicum group of films with the same three sets of variables used to study concurrent validity.

These findings are reported in Tables 6, 7, and 8.

TABLE 6
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCALE RATINGS AND
RANKING BY TOTAL STAFF ON PRE-PRACTICUM FILMS

Scale

	1	2	3	4	5	Cum-Pts.	Overall
J₁	.39*	.46*	.53**	.28	.31	.42*	.39*
J₂	.55**	.49**	.49**	.46*	.48**	.54**	.52**
J₁-J₂ Combined	.48**	.49**	.55**	.39*	.42*	.49**	.46*

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE 7
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCALE RATINGS AND
RANKING BY GRADERS FOR PRE-PRACTICUM FILMS

Scale

	1	2	3	4	5	Cum-Pts.	Overall
J_1	.41*	.47**	.58**	.27	.35	.45*	.42*
J_2	.58**	.50**	.52**	.48**	.50**	.56**	.55**
J_1-J_2 Combined	.51**	.50**	.60**	.39*	.45*	.52**	.49**

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE 8
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCALE RATINGS AND
PRACTICUM GRADE FOR PRE-PRACTICUM FILMS

Scale

	1	2	3	4	5	Cum-Pts.	Overall
J_1	.59**	.60**	.55**	.51**	.43**	.59**	.59**
J_2	.74**	.62**	.56**	.67**	.65**	.71**	.67**
J_1-J_2 Combined	.68**	.63**	.60**	.62**	.58**	.67**	.64**

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

The reliability and validity information described above indicate that a criterion instrument for evaluating counseling interviews was developed which is reliable and valid. Measures of reliability are consistently in the area of .80 to .90. The instrument was found to have concurrent and predictive validities which were both statistically and practically significant. Internal relationships between rating scales and objective behaviors related to the constructs support the construct validity of the instrument.

The instrument in short was found to be about as reliable and valid in predicting practicum grade or ranking from a single interview as is a typical scholastic aptitude test in predicting grade point average in college generally.

Construct Validity. Each scale contains a list of specific behaviors to which the rater must respond (by indicating whether the behavior occurred, whether it was appropriate, etc.) before he indicates his scale rating on the nine-point continuum. These behavioral descriptions are considered illustrative of the construct measured by the scale, and are intended to direct the rater's attention to relevant counselor behavior. It therefore was necessary to demonstrate an empirical as well as a logical relationship between these behaviors and the scale ratings themselves. For this reason, correlations were prepared showing the relationship between the ratings on each scale and the number of "Yes" responses made by the judges on that scale. These correlations are shown in Table 9. With the exception of Scale 3, nearly all the correlations are of substantial size. They indicate that the objective behaviors which underlie each scale did in fact serve as operational definitions. In a sense, these data constituted a measure of the construct validity of the criterion instrument.

TABLE 9
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCALE RATINGS AND CORRESPONDING
"YES" RESPONSES FOR ADJUSTED AND UNADJUSTED RATING

	Scale 1		2		3		4		5	
	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	A
J_1	.81	.73	.82	.75	.63	.51	.84	.75	.64	.54
J_2	.84	.81	.89	.88	.81	.78	.90	.88	.78	.80
J_3	.84	.80	.84	.77	.70	.69	.91	.82	.72	.76
J_1-J_3 Combined	.88	.88	.89	.89	.75	.75	.93	.93	.73	.73

U = Unadjusted Ratings

A = Adjusted Ratings

Study of Non-Verbal Behavior

A second aspect major of this study involved an attempt:

(1) To develop a reliable, replicable method for describing the non-verbal behavior of counselors in terms of theoretically relevant, but teachable and practical dimensions;

(2) To describe any differences and relationships between counselors rated high and low in terms of the dimensions;

(3) To determine if valid and practically useful predictions of good or poor counseling could be made through a regression approach with an equation consisting of the best non-verbal categories of behavior.

Category Development

Seventeen non-verbal categories were developed within a two-fold general ramework. First, it was decided that all categories must be descriptive of gross body behavior which is controlled by the voluntary muscles. Autonomic movements were discarded. It was decided to deal with behavior over which the counselor had conscious control, which could then, conceivable, be easily trained. Thus, the categories could have practical significance.

Second, all non-verbal categories had to be visible to the observer. Pilot inspection revealed that the camera angle and desk placement precluded much observation of the lower half of each counselor's body. Thus, three body areas were chosen for study. These were: head and neck, arms and hands, and body torso. By not including the legs and feet, it was believed that little relevant data were lost, since rarely was the lower half of the counselor visible to the client.

Categories of Non-Verbal Behavior

The following categories of non-verbal behavior were defined.

A. Head and neck positions, movements, or shifts.

1. Any Head Movement, including nods.
2. Only Head Nods.
3. Head is Turned Away from client.
4. Head is touched or supported by fingers, hand, fist, or arm or any part thereof.
5. Head support is shifted to #4.

B. Facial movements or change.

6. Lower facial expression changed (excluding smile).
7. Lower facial expression is a smile only.
8. Upper facial expression changed.

C. Arm-hand movements or shifts.

9. Any Hand Movement..
10. Only a Hand-arm gesture.
11. Any Arm Movement.

D. Body-torso movements, positions, or shifts.

12. Body position is Forward.
13. Body position is Upright.
14. Body position is Backward.
15. Body position is shifted among #12, 13, or 14.

E. Tongue-mouth-larynx movements

16. Mouth-tongue-larynx movement. Counselor Talks.
17. Shift to #16. Shift to talking. Speeches begun.

Inspection of the above categories will reveal that Categories #5, 15, and 17 are derived categories from others and were not directly scored from observation of the films. Category #16 was scored by listening to the audio portion of the interviews. Thirteen categories were scored from observing the films directly.

Scoring

Each film in the sample was scored according to the following system. A team of trained observers (either four or five) observed each film as often as was necessary to complete the tally of all the categories. On each run through, three observers intently watched the behavior of the counselor for the specific category they were trained to observe reliably. Each observer concentrated on only one category during each showing.

A buzzer, connected in series to the sweep hand of an electric clock, sounded every five seconds. If the behavior for which the observer was watching occurred during the five seconds between buzzes, he would call out a pre-arranged code name to a recorder who sat at a table away from the projected image, where he concentrated on recording the behaviors as they were called out by the observers.

The observers sat approximately four to eight feet away from the projected image which had dimensions of 2 feet by 3 feet. The recorder scored the tallies in the following manner. The scoring pad had 30 rows of twelve squares each. Each of the squares corresponded to a 5-second interval of time. Thus, as the buzzer sounded the beginning of a new 5-second interval, the recorder moved to the next square, successively, until the 360 squares had been passed over, denoting the end of the 30-minute filmed interview. (The interviews were slightly longer but only the first 30 minutes were scored.) Into the squares the recorder jotted the code for the behavior being called out by the observers. Each square, then, could have from 0 to 4 symbols in it, depending upon how many observers were calling out symbols and depending on whether or not all of them observed relevant behavior during one interval. It was found that one recorder could easily handle, without error, the response of three observers. Every successive 5-second time interval of the first 30 minutes of each film was observed and tallied in the manner described.

The tally sheets were then processed. One reader read aloud to another recorder separately for each category code either a 0 or a 1, depending on whether or not the category had been tallied in the particular square. The 1 meant that the behavior had been called out and recorded. The recorder now entered the 0's and the 1's onto a key punch coding sheet which was subsequently used by a key punch operator for the preparation of data cards. Not only was each 5-second time interval scored with a 0 or a 1, but at the end of each block of 12 squares, corresponding to a minute of time, a total, ranging from 0 to 12 was entered, representing the total number of 1's which had been recorded for that one minute. It was these one-minute totals which comprised the numerical data analyzed in this study.

A frequency count was not obtained for any of the categories. Instead for all categories, except #5, 15, 17, a measure of whether or not the behavior occurred in each successive 5-second time interval was taken. Many of the categories were comprised of behavior which was continuous in nature. It would give an unrealistic picture of the behavior if merely a frequency count were made. For example, if a counselor began smiling in one certain 5-second time interval and continued the smile unchanged for three more consecutive intervals, he would receive one tally for smile under the frequency method. Proper emphasis to duration of behavior was needed without timing directly each behavior for its duration. With the scoring system used here, the counselor in the example received a tally (a 1) for each time interval in which smiling behavior occurred. It was felt that X 4 entries for smiling behavior would more adequately reflect the magnitude of his smiling than one entry for frequency. In this manner, continuously occurring behavior is scored in proportion to the length of occurrence.

Categories #5, 15, and 17, were translated into data for analysis in a slightly different manner. The reader will remember that for the other categories a one-minute total was obtained. For example, for minute one of category one for counselor one, the total might be 9, meaning that in nine of the twelve 5-second intervals in minute one, this counselor exhibited a Head Movement.

In like manner, minute one of category four for counselor one may show the following pattern: 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 0, totalling 6 for minute one. It can be seen that the counselor shifted to the Head Support category in time interval 5 and stayed in that position for 30 seconds, receiving six 1's. Thus for Category 2 for the one minute total, he would receive a 2 since he shifted twice, once into and once out of the Head Support, Category 4. Categories 5, 15, and 17 were derived in like manner. For all categories, the one-minute total was used for analysis.

Selection of the Sample Behaviors

At the conclusion of training in June, 1964, each of the six counselor education staff members separately and independently had ranked the counselors in terms of global effectiveness as a high school counselor. From the six separate rankings, a pooled ranking was made, with the person rated highest ranked one, and the person rated lowest ranked 30. In addition, Practicum Grade for each trainee member was later determined through a staff committee, although no reference was made in regard to the ranking. Thus two separate measures, based on staff judgment, were made on each of the trainees.

Below is a summary table (Table 10) of the above judgments.

TABLE 10
POOLED STAFF RANK AND PRACTICUM GRADE FOR
THIRTY COUNSELING TRAINEES

Original Pooled Staff Rank	Practicum Grade
1	A
2	A
3	A
4	A
5	A
6	A
7	A
8	A
9	B
10	B
11	A
12	A
13	B
14	A
15	B
16	B
17	B
18	B
19	A
20	B
21	B
22	B
23	B
24	B
25	B
26	B
27	B
28	B
29	B
30	B

Two groups, a High and a Low group, were chosen from the 30, based upon the original pooled staff rank and the practicum grade. It was decided not to include the entire group of 30 in the samples. Consequently the middle ranges in the staff ranking were eliminated to obtain greater separation and to give greater opportunity for differences to appear. The non-verbal interview behavior of these two groups, now called the Criterion Groups, constituted the independent variables. The High Group consisted of counselors originally ranked 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,11, and 12, or, the highest 10 ranked persons who received A's in practicum. The Low Group were the ten lowest rated counselors all of whom received B's in practicum.

Hypotheses Tested

Three major hypotheses were tested in the analysis of the data.

Hypothesis 1. No differences in scores on any rating scales will appear between the Concentrated and Distributed Practicum groups.

Hypothesis 2. The seventeen non-verbal categories will not differentiate between the behavior of two groups of counselors judged to be High and Low in effectiveness.

Hypothesis 3. Regression equations cannot be constructed on the basis of scores of the seventeen non-verbal categories which will predict whether behavior was drawn from "High or Low" rated criterion groups.

Analysis of the Data

Analysis of Treatment Effects

In order to analyze the effects of the Concentrated and Distributed Practicum Treatments, six one-way ANOVAS were run comparing the two group scores on each of the five interview rating scales plus the overall interview ratings. The resulting F ratios are summarized in Table 11 below.

TABLE 11
Results of Analysis of Variance Comparing Post-Practicum Interview Scores of Distributed and Concentrated Practicum Groups by Scale and on Overall Rating

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	Overall Rating
F ratios 28 d.o.f.	2.33	1.23	.81	.95	1.42	1.04

None of the F ratios above are significant at even the .05 level of significance. In fact, a remarkable similarity between the two groups seems to exist. After sixty hours of practicum treatment in two different schedules of presentation, the two groups showed quite similar distributions of scores.

Hypothesis number one of no difference between treatments is accepted. No differences between Concentrated and Distributed Practicum Treatments were found.

Analysis of Non-Verbal Behavior

The analysis was conducted in three phases: the computing of ANOVAS, the deriving of regression equations, and cross-validation.

ANOVA. The unit of measure for analysis was the one-minute total for each category. The minute-by-minute totals were summed over all post practicum films in each group. Hence, there were 30 scores for each High group and 30 for each Low group. A one-way ANOVA was run separately for each of the seventeen non-verbal categories. The results of this analysis are in Table 12 below.

TABLE 12
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN NON-VERBAL
BEHAVIOR CATEGORY SCORES OF HIGH AND LOW RATED COUNSELORS

| Category | 600 Minutes | | |
	F	P	High Score Direction
1 Head Movement	40. +	.01	Low Group
2 Head Nod	80. +	.01	Low Group
3 Head Away		ns	
4 Head Support	10. +	.01	Low Group
5 Head Support Shifted	16. +	.01	High Group
6 Lower Facial		ns	
7 Smile Only	17. +	.01	Low Group
8 Upper Facial		ns	
9 Hand Movement		ns	
10 Hand Gesture	20. +	.01	High Group
11 Arm Movement	33. +	.01	High Group
12 Body Forward		ns	
13 Body Upright		ns	
14 Body Backward		ns	
15 Body Shift	13. +	.01	High Group
16 Talk Movement	44. +	.01	High Group
17 Talk Shift	11. +	.01	High Group

Of the seventeen ANOVAS run, 10 showed significance at the .01 level. Hypothesis number two is thus rejected in 10 of the 17 tests. It is possible to differentiate reliably between the non-verbal behaviors of High and Low rated counselors.

Thus, it can be reliably stated from the results of the ANOVAS that for the Criterion Groups, the counselors in the "High Group" were characterized by: (1) shifting their hands to their heads, (2) gesturing, (3) moving their arms, (4) shifting body positions, (5) talking, and (6) beginning speeches to a greater degree than counselors in the Low Group. The counselors in the "Low Group" were characterized by: (1) moving their heads, (2) nodding, (3) supporting their heads with their hands, and (4) smiling to a greater degree than the counselors in the "High Group."

Regression Equations

The seventeen predictor variables were combined in a multiple regression equation for predicting the criterion of High-Low rated counseling. Since some form of cross-validation was considered necessary to test the usefulness of these equations and their theoretical relevance, it was decided to build regression equations using one-half of the data and cross-validating on the remaining one-half. Two such divisions were made. One-half of the total twenty interviews of the Criterion Group were selected randomly by choosing the odd numbered minutes of counseling time and building equations based on these minute scores. Similarly the High and Low rated groups of counselors were randomly divided so that five counseling interviews from each group were used to build equations with the remaining interviews saved for cross-validation purposes.

Table 13 below shows the results from these equations based on three hundred minutes or one-half of the total time of the twenty half-hour interviews of the Criterion Group. Since it seemed possible that non-verbal behavior might vary from one part of an interview to another, the interviews were scored by ten minute segments or thirds as well as by total interview to give separate equations drawn from   first one-third, middle one-third and final one-third of the data.

TABLE 13
CRITERION GROUPS: 300 ONE-MINUTE SAMPLING OF NON-VERBAL
INTERVIEW BEHAVIOR REPRESENTING TEN RANDOMLY SAMPLED
COMPLETE INTERVIEWS BY TOTAL AND BY TIME SEGMENT

Interview Portion	Predictors	R	R^2
Total =	2,3,6,11,14,15	.517	.267
First 1/3	2,3,6,9,12,13	.533	.284
Second 1/3	2,4,6,11	.514	.264
Third 1/3	2,3,14,15	.671	.451

1=Head Movement
2=Head Nod
3=Head Away
4=Head Support
5=Head Support Shift
6=Lower Facial Movement
7=Smile Only
8=Upper Facial Movement
9=Hand Movement

10=Hand Gesture
11=Arm Movement
12=Body Forward
13=Body Upright
14=Body Backward
15=Body Shift
16=Talk
17=Talk Shift

As Table 13 indicates, when the one minute non-verbal behavior scores on the significant categories are taken on one-half of the high rated and one-half of the low rated counselor complete interviews, we are able to predict the criterion of High-Low rated counselor with multiple R's on the order of .5 to .6.

Table 14 below shows multiple R's obtained by taking random samples composed of odd-numbered minutes of all Criterion Group interviews. These multiple R's are slightly lower, but continue to predict the criterion at a substantial level.

TABLE 14
SUMMARY TABLE OF MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS RESULTING FROM
COMBINATIONS OF THE BEST OF SEVENTEEN INDEPENDENT
PREDICTORS WITH THE CRITERION

CRITERION GROUPS: 300 ONE MINUTE SAMPLES OF NON-VERBAL COUNSELOR BEHAVIOR TAKEN EQUALLY FROM EACH INTERVIEW BY TOTAL AND BY TIME SEGMENT			
Interview Portion	Predictors	R	R^2
Total	2,3,7,11,16	.474	.224
First 1/3	1,3,5,16	.485	.235
Second 1/3	2,16	.470	.221
Third 1/3	2,3,11	.474	.224

1=Head Movement	10=Hand Gesture
2=Head Nod	11=Arm Movement
3=Head Away	12=Body Forward
4=Head Support	13=Body Upright
5=Head Support Shift	14=Body Backward
6=Lower Facial Movement	15=Body Shift
7=Smile Only	16=Talk
8=Upper Facial Movement	17=Talk Shift
9=Hand Movement	

Cross-Validation

An effort to cross-validate the equations obtained in the procedures
described above was made to determine the amount of shrinkage found when the
equations were used with independent samples of behavior. It was decided to express
the results of the procedure in terms of the percentage of correct assignments into
High or Low rated groups for repeated one-minute samples of behavior taken from the
remaining one-half of data. In other words, a statistic was used expressing
the percentage of correct assignments of one-minute samples of one-half of the
data which could be made with the use of regression equations built on the alternate
half.

Two divisions of the data had been made as described above. Table 15 below
shows the results from the cross-validation made within interviews and including
all counselors in the Criterion Group.

TABLE 15
SUMMARY TABLE OF CRITERION GROUP CROSS VALIDATION
(WITHIN COUNSELORS) 20 FIVE MINUTE COUNSELING SEGMENTS
SAMPLED RANDOMLY AND EQUALLY FROM EACH OF 20 INTERVIEWS

Interview Portion	Predictors	Results		
		Predicted		
First 1/3	1,3,5,16	High	Low	
		High 7	3	10
		Known		
		Low 2	8	10
				20

15/20=75% predicted correct]

CRITERION GROUP CROSS VALIDATION:
100 ONE-MINUTE COUNSELING SEGMENTS
SAMPLED EQUALLY FROM EACH OF 20 INTERVIEWS

Interview Portion	Predictors	Results		
		Predicted		
Second 1/3	2,16	High	Low	
		High 32	18	50
		Known		
		Low 19	31	50
				100

63/100=63% predicted correct]

CRITERION GROUP CROSS VALIDATION:
20 FIVE-MINUTE COUNSELING SEGMENTS
RANDOMLY AND EQUALLY FROM EACH OF 20 INTERVIEWS

Interview Portion	Predictors	Results		
		Predicted		
Second 1/3	2,16	High	Low	
		High 9	1	10
		Known		
		Low 1	9	10
				20

18/20=90% predicted correctly

CRITERION GROUP CROSS VALIDATION:
100 ONE-MINUTE COUNSELING SEGMENTS
SAMPLED EQUALLY FROM EACH OF 20 INTERVIEWS

Interview Portion	Predictors	Results Predicted		
			High	Low
Third 1/3	2,3,11	High	33	17	50
		Known			
		Low	14	36	50
					100

69/100=69% predicted correctly

CRITERION GROUP CROSS VALIDATION:
20 FIVE-MINUTE COUNSELING SEGMENTS
RANDOMLY AND EQUALLY FROM EACH OF 20 INTERVIEWS

Interview Portion	Predictors	Results Predicted		
			High	Low
Third 1/3	2,3,11	High	9	1	10
		Known			
		Low	1	9	10
					20

18/20=90% predicted correctly

As Table 15 shows, when a regression equation based on the odd numbered minutes of interview time is tested against the even numbered minute scores, the equation holds up to the extent that when twenty clusters of five one-minute samples of behavior are assigned using the equation, correct assignments are made in from 75% to 90% of the cases. Chance on this dichotomous criterion is of course 50%. This is more accurately a measure of the internal reliability of the non-verbal behavior scores than a cross-validation since the comparison is within interviews and not across counselors.

When the across counselor comparison is made, that is when one-half of each of the High and Low groups are compared with the other half, more shrinkage of predictive efficiency occurs. Table 16 below shows these results.

TABLE 16
SUMMARY TABLE OF CROSS-VALIDATION ACROSS COUNSELORS
USING REGRESSION EQUATIONS DERIVED FROM ONE-HALF
OF THE COUNSELORS TO PREDICT CRITERION VIA DISCRIMINANT
METHOD WITH OTHER HALF OF COUNSELORS

CROSS-VALIDATION
300 ONE-MINUTE COUNSELING SEGMENTS
SAMPLED EQUALLY FROM EACH OF 20 INTERVIEWS

Interview Portion	Predictors	Results		
		Predicted		
Total	2,3,7,11,16	High	Low	
		High 66	84	150
		Known		
		Low 44	106	150
				300

172/300=57% predicted correctly

CROSS-VALIDATION:
60 FIVE-MINUTE COUNSELING SEGMENTS
SAMPLED RANDOMLY AND EQUALLY FROM EACH OF 20 INTERVIEWS

Interview Portion	Predictors	Results		
		Predicted		
Total	2,3,7,11,16	High	Low	
		High 19	11	30
		Known		
		Low 3	27	30
				60

46/60=77% predicted correctly

(TABLE 16 Continued)

CROSS-VALIDATION:
100 ONE-MINUTE COUNSELING SEGMENTS
SAMPLED EQUALLY FROM EACH OF 20 INTERVIEWS

Interview Portion	Predictors	Results Predicted			
			High	Low	
First 1/3	1,3,5,16	High	29	21	50
		Known			
		Low	20	30	50
					100

59/100=59% predicted correctly

As Table 16 shows when cross-validation across counselors is done, the percentage of correct predictions shrinks considerably. Here the equation will predict correctly from 55% to 77% of the time. While these results are considerably better than chance, they indicate that predictive efficiency of an equation based upon one group of counselors does shrink when tested upon another group of similarly rated counselors.

These results do demonstrate the fact, however, that it is possible to construct regression equations which can differentiate between the behavior of High and Low rated counselors at better than chance levels. Thus, null hypothesis number three is rejected.

Conclusions and Implications

This study was deliberately planned as a preliminary and, in a sense, a pilot study devoted as much to the development of a methodology for studying outcomes in counselor education as for the production of highly definitive evidence regarding the evaluation of counselor education practices.

Limitations

A number of very real limitations must be kept in mind in any interpretation of the results of the study. First, all of the thirty counselors-in-training who were studied in this project were in one counselor education program. Criteria used were primarily judgments by members of one counselor education staff, or instruments developed to measure objectives of that counselor education program. Generalizability of results beyond this program is very dangerous. Agreement regarding goals of both counseling and counselor education is presently so limited that little commonality in point of view can be assumed between any two programs.

Secondly, the filmed samples of counselor behavior used as a basis for observations were limited to initial interviews of only one-half hour. Both counselors and clients were aware of the filming process and undoubtedly some artificiality of behavior was introduced into their interaction.

Finally, the criteria used are entirely confined to assessments of interview process and have not been shown to be related to any kind of ultimate criterion of counselor effectiveness, that is a criterion based on actual changes in client behavior. Research which is devoted to identifying relationships between incermediate, process kinds of criteria and output variables in terms of client change, is needed before the interpretation of changes in counselor interview behavior can be very meaningful.

Despite these limitations this study did produce a number of the findings which are both practically and theoretically important.

First, as a result of this project a set of measuring instruments was developed which were tied to objectives of the counselor education program and which were firmly rooted in the interview behaviors of counselors-in-training. This instrument was found to be reliable in the hands of experienced counselor educators and to be valid in predicting practicum grades and staff ratings of trainees.

In fact, this instrument was able to predict practicum grades given six months later about as well as scholastic aptitude tests given in high school are able to predict college grades.

Using scores on this instrument as a criterion, the outcomes of two types of counseling practicum treatments were assessed. A Distributed Practicum Group which had sixty hours of supervised practicum distributed over a six month period was found to be no different in terms of measured outcomes than a Concentrated Practicum Group which had received the traditional practicum consisting of the same number of hours concentrated into the final three months of the program.

Secondly, it was found possible to differentiate between the non-verbal interview behaviors of High and Low rated counselors-in-training on ten categories of behavior. These results indicated that High rated counselors tended to be more active and animated in terms of gross body movements than Low rated counselors. Low rated counselors tended to use head and facial movements of nodding and smiling to a greater degree. They were physically more limited in movements, suggesting a kind of passive and rigid pattern of behavior.

When frequency scores on categories of non-verbal behavior were used as predictor variables, it was possible to construct regression equations which could predict whether given samples of interview behavior were drawn from films of High or Low rated counselors. Upon cross-validation on independent sets of samples, these equations continued to predict above chance levels.

Implications for Future Research

A number of directions for future research are opened by this study. The ability of the ten non-verbal behavior categories to differentiate between High and Low rated counselors should be retested on a new group of counselors. The relationship of both verbal and non-verbal counseling process variables to client satisfaction and client behavior change should be investigated. Personality

variables among counselors with differing patterns of non-verbal behavior should be studied in order to identify possible relationships.

Practicum treatments based upon varying treatments including group dynamics, behavior modification, and role modeling should be compared using instruments developed in this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, Robert P. and Gordon V. Anderson. "Development of an Instrument for Measuring Rapport" Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 41, 18-24.

2. Buckheimer, A. and S. Carter. "An Analysis of Empathic Behavior of Counselor Trainees in a Laboratory Practicum" American Psychologist, 1958, 14, 352 (abstract).

3. Campbell, Robert E. "Counselor Personality and Background and His Interview Subrole Behavior" Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 329-334.

4. Danskin, David G. "Roles Played by Counselors in Their Interviews" Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 22-27.

5. Davity, Joel R. and Lois Jean Davity. "Nonverbal Vocal Communication of Feeling" Journal of Communication, 1961, 11, 2:81-86.

6. Dipboye, W.J. "Analysis of Counselor Style by Discussion Units" Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 21-26.

7. Dohrenwend, B.S. and S.A. Richardson. "Directiveness and Nondirectiveness in Research Interviewing: A Reformulation of the Problem" Psychology Bulletin, 1963, 60, 5:475-485.

8. Drasgow, James and Robert Walker. "A Graphic Description of Counseling Relationships" Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 1:51-55.

9. Ellsworth, Sterling G. "The Consistency of Counselor Feeling-Verbalization" Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 356-361.

10. Fiedler, F.E. "A Comparison of Therapeutic Relationships in Psychoanalytic Therapy, Non-directive and Adlerian" Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 436-455.

11. Grigg, Austin E. "Client Response to Counselors at Different Levels of Experience" Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 3:217-223.

12. Guze, Samuel B. and Ivan N. Mensh. "An Analysis of Some Features of the Interview with the Interaction Chronograph" Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 269-271.

13. Hoffman, A. Edward. "An Analysis of Counselor Sub-Roles" Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, 61-67.

14. Howe, E.S. and B. Pope. "An Empirical Scale of Therapist Verbal Activity Level in the Initial Interview" Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 6:510-520.

15. Kaufer, Frederick H. "Verbal Rate, Content, and Adjustment Ratings in Experimentally Structured Interviews" Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 305-311.

16. Koester, G.A. "A Study of the Diagnostic Process" <u>Educational and Psychological Measurement</u>, 1954, 14, 473-486.

17. Moos, Rudolph H. "The Retention and Generalization of Operant Conditioning Effects in an Interview Situation" <u>Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology</u>, 1963, 66, 1:52-58.

18. O'Hearn, Jane S. and Dugald S. Arbuckle. "Sensitivity: A Measurable Concept?" <u>Personnel and Guidance Journal</u>, 1964, 42, 572-576.

19. Parker, Clyde. "As a Clinician Thinks" <u>Journal of Counseling Psychology</u>, 1958, 5, 4:253-262.

20. Robinson, F.P. "The Dynamics of Communication in Counseling" <u>Journal of Counseling Psychology</u>, 1955, 2, 163-169.

21. Sydiaha, Daniel. "Bules' Interaction Process Analysis of Personnel Selection Interviews" <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1961, 45, 393-401.

INTERVIEW RATING SCALES
Herbert M. Burks, Jr.

Attached is a set of scales for evaluating five dimensions of counselor behavior
in the interview:

        Scale No. 1 - Role Adaptation
        Scale No. 2 - Cognitive Flexibility
        Scale No. 3 - Consistency of Communication between Verbal and
                     Nonverbal Behavior
        Scale No. 4 - Perceptual Sensitivity
        Scale No. 5 - Involvement with Client

For each scale, the rater is asked first to make a judgment concerning each of
the specific behaviors listed, according to the directions for that scale. He
is then asked to assign a number from 1 to 9 to indicate his rating for the
counselor on that particular dimension.

After completing the five scales, the rater is asked to assign a number from 1
to 9 to indicate his general evaluation of the interview.

Each scale should be evaluated on its own merits, without regard to any of the
other scales. Likewise, the evaluation of the interview as a whole should be
made on the basis of one's general impression, without conscious reference to
the five scales.

Scale No. 1: Role Adaptation

In order to meet the client's needs, the counselor is often called upon to play a wide variety of roles in the interview. His success in using various roles depends upon several factors: (a) the number of roles in which he is able to engage; (b) his ability to choose the proper role at a particular point in time with a particular client; (c) his ability to shift roles in an efficient manner as the need arises (or, conversely, to continue in his present role if there is no need to shift).

Observation of Specific Behaviors: The following behaviors are grouped according to various counselor roles. For each behavior, you are asked to make two judgments: (1) whether or not the counselor engaged in this behavior, and (2) whether his engaging or not engaging in the behavior was appropriate. For each behavior, circle "A" (for "Appropriate") or "I" (for "Inappropriate") under the applicable heading.

	Engaged In		Did Not Engage In	

Advising

1. Encourages the client to accept responsibility for his own actions and decisions.	A	I	A	I
2. Tells the client that only he (the client) can make a decision.	A	I	A	I
3. Tells the client he can change his behavior if he tries.	A	I	A	I
4. Suggests one solution to the client's problem.	A	I	A	I
5. Advises the client to take a particular course of action.	A	I	A	I

Exploring Alternatives

6. Serves as an objective "reality-tester"; for example, helps the client to think about important aspects of a problem or of a situation which he has not considered.	A	I	A	I
7. Encourages the client to think of alternative solutions to his problem.	A	I	A	I
8. Mentions all possible consequences of the client's behavior.	A	I	A	I
9. Points out choices open to the client.	A	I	A	I

Facilitating Client Communication

10. Listens for a considerable period of time without commenting.	A	I	A	I

11. Usually waits during silences for the client to

depends upon several factors: (a) the number of roles in which he is able to engage; (b) his ability to choose the proper role at a particular point in time with a particular client; (c) his ability to shift roles in an efficient manner as the need arises (or, conversely, to continue in his present role if there is no need to shift).

Observation of Specific Behaviors: The following behaviors are grouped according to various counselor roles. For each behavior, you are asked to make two judgments: (1) whether or not the counselor engaged in this behavior, and (2) whether his engaging or not engaging in the behavior was appropriate. For each behavior, circle "A" (for "Appropriate") or "I" (for "Inappropriate") under the applicable heading.

	Engaged In	Did Not Engage In

Advising

	Engaged In		Did Not Engage In	
1. Encourages the client to accept responsibility for his own actions and decisions.	A	I	A	I
2. Tells the client that only he (the client) can make a decision.	A	I	A	I
3. Tells the client he can change his behavior if he tries.	A	I	A	I
4. Suggests one solution to the client's problem.	A	I	A	I
5. Advises the client to take a particular course of action.	A	I	A	I

Exploring Alternatives

	Engaged In		Did Not Engage In	
6. Serves as an objective "reality-tester"; for example, helps the client to think about important aspects of a problem or of a situation which he has not considered.	A	I	A	I
7. Encourages the client to think of alternative solutions to his problem.	A	I	A	I
8. Mentions all possible consequences of the client's behavior.	A	I	A	I
9. Points out choices open to the client.	A	I	A	I

Facilitating Client Communication

	Engaged In		Did Not Engage In	
10. Listens for a considerable period of time without commenting.	A	I	A	I
11. Usually waits during silences for the client to respond.	A	I	A	I
12. Frequently restates what the client has said.	A	I	A	I
13. Frequently clarifies what the client is saying.	A	I	A	I
14. Frequently reflects feelings of the client.	A	I	A	I

		Engaged In		Did Not Engage In	

Information-Giving

15.	Suggests sources of information the client may use to answer his questions.	A	I	A	I
16.	Offers the client educational, occupational, and/or other kinds of factual information.	A	I	A	I
17.	Provides the client with factual information when he requests it.	A	I	A	I

Structuring

18.	Asks the client how he feels about the interview being recorded or observed.	A	I	A	I
19.	Asks the client why he is seeking counseling.	A	I	A	I
20.	Asks the client what he expects from counseling.	A	I	A	I
21.	Explains his purposes in the interview to the client.	A	I	A	I
22.	Discusses his role with the client.	A	I	A	I
23.	Makes structuring remarks when the client seems unsure as to the purposes of the interview.	A	I	A	I

Supporting

| 24. | Makes encouraging, reassuring remarks to the client. | A | I | A | I |
| 25. | Praises or compliments something the client has said or done. | A | I | A | I |

Teaching

26.	Interprets test results to the client.	A	I	A	I
27.	Teaches a method of problem-solving; helps the client to explore ways of solving problems in general, or ways of solving a particular problem.	A	I	A	I
28.	Engages in an explicit role-playing situation with the client.	A	I	A	I
29.	Explains or interprets orally the client's behavior.	A	I	A	I
30.	Mentions what other people might do in the client's situation.	A	I	A	I
31.	Makes a verbal evaluation of the client's plans or ideas.	A	I	A	I

Miscellaneous

32.	Engages in a friendly discussion of a general topic.	A	I	A	I
33.	Lets the client select the topics of the interview.	A	I	A	I
34.	Discusses the client's educational and vocational plans.	A	I	A	I

17. Provides the client with factual information
    when he requests it.   A   I   A   I

Structuring

18. Asks the client how he feels about the interview
    being recorded or observed.   A   I   A   I

19. Asks the client why he is seeking counseling.   A   I   A   I

20. Asks the client what he expects from counseling.   A   I   A   I

21. Explains his purposes in the interview to the
    client.   A   I   A   I

22. Discusses his role with the client.   A   I   A   I

23. Makes structuring remarks when the client seems
    unsure as to the purposes of the interview.   A   I   A   I

Supporting

24. Makes encouraging, reassuring remarks to the client.   A   I   A   I

25. Praises or compliments something the client has
    said or done.   A   I   A   I

Teaching

26. Interprets test results to the client.   A   I   A   I

27. Teaches a method of problem-solving; helps the client
    to explore ways of solving problems in general, or
    ways of solving a particular problem.   A   I   A   I

28. Engages in an explicit role-playing situation
    with the client.   A   I   A   I

29. Explains or interprets orally the client's behavior.   A   I   A   I

30. Mentions what other people might do in the client's
    situation.   A   I   A   I

31. Makes a verbal evaluation of the client's plans
    or ideas.   A   I   A   I

Miscellaneous

32. Engages in a friendly discussion of a general topic.   A   I   A   I

33. Lets the client select the topics of the interview.   A   I   A   I

34. Discusses the client's educational and vocational
    plans.   A   I   A   I

35. Asks questions intended to get factual information
    about the client.   A   I   A   I

Overall Rating on Role Adaptation: Considering the definition of this dimension, the specific role behaviors observed, and the degree to which these behaviors were used appropriately, circle a number on the following scale to indicate your overall rating of the counselor on Role Adaptation.

```
      1       2       3       4       5       6       7       8       9
      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____
```

Apparently has available a limited number of roles, but uses them inappropriately throughout the interview. Persists in an inappropriate role and/or changes roles in a seemingly capricious manner. Seems unaware that he is "lost."	Apparently has available a limited number of roles, but has difficulty applying them appropriately. Frequently persists in an inappropriate role. Often seems "lost," and resorts to ineffective fumbling and searching.	Apparently has available several roles and is able to employ them appropriately, but often shows hesitation in shifting from one role to another. However, recovers and "finds himself" relatively soon.	Apparently has available a broad range of roles. Engages in appropriate roles at nearly all times, but shows some hesitation and uncertainty in shifting from one role to another.	Apparently has available a broad range of roles. Engages in appropriate roles at all times. Shifts quickly and smoothly from one role to another as the need arises but does not shift prematurely or unnecessarily.

Scale No. 2: Cognitive Flexibility

The counselor is a person to whom a client comes to get a fresh and different perspective about himself and his concerns. In meeting this need, the counselor responds in diverse and creative ways which reflect his "Cognitive Flexibility." There are three aspects to this dimension: (a) the counselor's range of psychological concepts for understanding human behavior; (b) his repertoire of interview techniques within a particular role; and (c) his supply of relevant information about the client and his world.

Observation of Specific Behaviors: The following are some of the behaviors from which Cognitive Flexibility may be inferred. For convenience in performing the overall rating at the end of this scale, the specific behaviors to be observed have been grouped according to the three components of Cognitive Flexibility. For each behavior:

Circle "YES" if the behavior occurred in this interview.
Circle "NO" if the behavior should have occurred in this interview, but did not.
Circle "N/A" (for "Not Applicable") if the behavior failed to occur because it was irrelevant to this interview.

Psychological Concepts

1. Responds in ways which suggest that he has a consistent psychological framework for understanding the client's behavior. YES NO N/A

2. Uses test scores and other information to construct a psychological "picture" of the client. YES NO N/A

3. Combines seemingly unrelated facets of the client's problem or situation in ways that make "psychological sense." YES NO N/A

4. Suggests tentative causal relationships between past experiences and the client's present behavior. YES NO N/A

5. Uses clinical hunches. For example, explores the possibility that a client's hostility toward authority figures is related to his feelings about his parents. YES NO N/A

Interview Techniques

6. Responds with an economy of words; does not ramble or repeat himself unnecessarily; is not overly wordy. YES NO N/A

7. Uses a wide variety of "leads" to help the client talk about his situation. YES NO N/A

8. Helps the client to focus on a particular topic. YES NO N/A

9. Asks questions which seem to have a clear and relevant purpose in the interview; does not ask a "standard catalog" of questions. YES NO N/A

Phrases questions in an open-ended manner, i.e.,

responds in diverse and creative ways which reflect his "Cognitive Flexibility." There are three aspects to this dimension: (a) the counselor's range of psychological concepts for understanding human behavior; (b) his repertoire of interview techniques within a particular role; and (c) his supply of relevant information about the client and his world.

<u>Observation of Specific Behaviors</u>: The following are some of the behaviors from which Cognitive Flexibility may be inferred. For convenience in performing the overall rating at the end of this scale, the specific behaviors to be observed have been grouped according to the three components of Cognitive Flexibility. For <u>each</u> behavior:

Circle "YES" if the behavior occurred in this interview.
Circle "NO" if the behavior should have occurred in this interview, but did not.
Circle "N/A" (for "Not Applicable") if the behavior failed to occur because it was irrelevant to this interview.

Psychological Concepts

1. Responds in ways which suggest that he has a consistent psychological framework for understanding the client's behavior.   YES   NO   N/A

2. Uses test scores and other information to construct a psychological "picture" of the client.   YES   NO   N/A

3. Combines seemingly unrelated facets of the client's problem or situation in ways that make "psychological sense."   YES   NO   N/A

4. Suggests tentative causal relationships between past experiences and the client's present behavior.   YES   NO   N/A

5. Uses clinical hunches. For example, explores the possibility that a client's hostility toward authority figures is related to his feelings about his parents.   YES   NO   N/A

Interview Techniques

6. Responds with an economy of words; does not ramble or repeat himself unnecessarily; is not overly wordy.   YES   NO   N/A

7. Uses a wide variety of "leads" to help the client talk about his situation.   YES   NO   N/A

8. Helps the client to focus on a particular topic.   YES   NO   N/A

9. Asks questions which seem to have a clear and relevant purpose in the interview; does not ask a "standard catalog" of questions.   YES   NO   N/A

10. Phrases questions in an open-ended manner, i.e., which cannot be answered simply "Yes" or "No."   YES   NO   N/A

11. Asks the client to tell him more about a topic.   YES   NO   N/A

12. Achieves movement in the interview. There is an evident and sensible progression of topics.   YES   NO   N/A

13. Speaks of test results in descriptive terms rather than scores.   YES   NO   N/A

14. Discusses the relationship of test results to other information about the client.   YES   NO   N/A

15. Uses diagrams, sketches, or other visual aids in
    the interview.   YES   NO   N/A

16. Asks the client to state how he would like to
    change his behavior.   YES   NO   N/A

17. Tentatively suggests an approach or solution to the
    problem under discussion which the client has not
    mentioned.   YES   NO   N/A

18. Tentatively suggests some new behavior which the
    client might try out to improve his situation.   YES   NO   N/A

19. Asks the client to summarize what has been said.   YES   NO   N/A

20. Summarizes what has been said.   YES   NO   N/A

21. Offers the client an opportunity to return for
    another interview.   YES   NO   N/A

Supply of Relevant Information

Responds in ways which suggest that he:

22. has an adequate supply of information about the
    client (e.g., cumulative record information).   YES   NO   N/A

23. has an adequate supply of educational information
    (colleges, trade and technical schools, etc.).   YES   NO   N/A

24. has an adequate supply of occupational information
    (general knowledge of the world of work, information
    about the occupational areas in which the client has
    expressed an interest, etc.).   YES   NO   N/A

25. has an adequate knowledge of sources of information
    (directories, catalogs, people, etc., that the
    client might consult for answers to his questions).   YES   NO   N/A

Overall Rating on Cognitive Flexibility: Considering the definition of this dimension
    and the specific behaviors observed in the interview, circle a number on the
    following scale to indicate your overall rating of the counselor on Cognitive
    Flexibility. Bear in mind that the three components of this dimension are:
    (a) psychological concepts, (b) interview techniques, and (c) relevant
    information.

```
         1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9
         |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
```

| Low on all three components. Uses a very limited range of psychological concepts, interview techniques and relevant | Low on two components; or low on one and moderate on two. | Moderate on all three components; or high on one, moderate on one, and low on one. | High on two components; or high on one and moderate on two. | High on all three components. Uses a wide range of psychological concepts, interview techniques, an relevant |

15. Uses diagrams, sketches, or other visual aids in
    the interview.   YES   NO   N/A

16. Asks the client to state how he would like to
    change his behavior.   YES   NO   N/A

17. Tentatively suggests an approach or solution to the
    problem under discussion which the client has not
    mentioned.   YES   NO   N/A

18. Tentatively suggests some new behavior which the
    client might try out to improve his situation.   YES   NO   N/A

19. Asks the client to summarize what has been said.   YES   NO   N/A

20. Summarizes what has been said.   YES   NO   N/A

21. Offers the client an opportunity to return for
    another interview.   YES   NO   N/A

Supply of Relevant Information

Responds in ways which suggest that he:

22. has an adequate supply of information about the
    client (e.g., cumulative record information).   YES   NO   N/A

23. has an adequate supply of educational information
    (colleges, trade and technical schools, etc.).   YES   NO   N/A

24. has an adequate supply of occupational information
    (general knowledge of the world of work, information
    about the occupational areas in which the client has
    expressed an interest, etc.).   YES   NO   N/A

25. has an adequate knowledge of sources of information
    (directories, catalogs, people, etc., that the
    client might consult for answers to his questions).   YES   NO   N/A

Overall Rating on Cognitive Flexibility: Considering the definition of this dimension
    and the specific behaviors observed in the interview, circle a number on the
    following scale to indicate your overall rating of the counselor on Cognitive
    Flexibility. Bear in mind that the three components of this dimension are:
    (a) psychological concepts, (b) interview techniques, and (c) relevant
    information.

```
    1       2       3       4       5       6       7       8       9
    |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
```

| Low on all three components. Uses a very limited range of psychological concepts, interview techniques and relevant information. | Low on two components; or low on one and moderate on two. | Moderate on all three components; or high on one, moderate on one, and low on one. | High on two components; or high on one and moderate on two. | High on all three components. Uses a wide range of psychological concepts, interview techniques, an relevant information. |

Scale No. 3: <u>Consistency of Communication between Verbal and Non-Verbal Behavior</u>

The counselor communicates with the client in verbal and non-verbal ways. He sends out "signals" to the client by means of (1) what he says verbally, and (2) his voice inflection, facial expression, posture, gestures, and mannerisms. The counselor's Consistency of Communication can be ascertained by observing the degree to which his verbal and non-verbal behaviors are compatible, i.e., the extent to which they convey the same meaning.

<u>Observation of Specific Behaviors</u>: The following are some of the specific behaviors from which Consistency of Communication may be inferred. For <u>each</u> behavior:

Circle "YES" if the behavior occurred in this interview.
Circle "NO" if the behavior should have occurred in this interview but did not.
Circle "N/A" (for "Not Applicable") if the behavior failed to occur because it was irrelevant to this interview.

1. Admits his ignorance when his non-verbal behavior (e.g., "puzzled" facial expression) suggests that he is unable to answer the client's question.　　YES　NO　N/A

2. When his facial expression or other non-verbal features suggest that he does not agree with the client, he states his disagreement verbally.　　YES　NO　N/A

3. When his non-verbal behavior (e.g., looking away from the client, "startled' facial expression) suggests that he is shocked or offended by something the client has said, he states his feeling to the client.　　YES　NO　N/A

4. Smiles when he makes a humorous remark to the client.　　YES　NO　N/A

5. Frowns when he states that he does not comprehend what the client is saying.　　YES　NO　N/A

6. Frowns when he states his disapproval of something the client has said.　　YES　NO　N/A

7. When he looks perplexed by something the client has said, he mentions his confusion to the client. In such situations, he does <u>not</u> nod or say "Um-hum," "I see," "I understand," etc.　　YES　NO　N/A

8. Nods when his remarks suggest that he agrees with something the client has said.　　YES　NO　N/A

9. Shakes his head from side to side when he states his disagreement with something the client has said.　　YES　NO　N/A

10. Tone of voice is compatible with the verbal content of his responses. For example, when he says, "I understand how you feel about this problem,"his voice tone communicates an earnest "I <u>really</u> know how you feel," rather than a business-like "I know how you feel; I've seen many others who felt the same

The counselor communicates with the client in verbal and non-verbal ways. He sends out "signals" to the client by means of (1) what he says verbally, and (2) his voice inflection, facial expression, posture, gestures, and mannerisms. The counselor's Consistency of Communication can be ascertained by observing the degree to which his verbal and non-verbal behaviors are compatible, i.e., the extent to which they convey the same meaning.

<u>Observation of Specific Behaviors</u>: The following are some of the specific behaviors from which Consistency of Communication may be inferred. For <u>each</u> behavior:

Circle "YES" if the behavior occurred in this interview.
Circle "NO" if the behavior should have occurred in this interview but did not.
Circle "N/A" (for "Not Applicable") if the behavior failed to occur because it was irrelevant to this interview.

1. Admits his ignorance when his non-verbal behavior (e.g., "puzzled" facial expression) suggests that he is unable to answer the client's question.   YES   NO   N/A

2. When his facial expression or other non-verbal features suggest that he does not agree with the client, he states his disagreement verbally.   YES   NO   N/A

3. When his non-verbal behavior (e.g., looking away from the client, "startled' facial expression) suggests that he is shocked or offended by something the client has said, he states his feeling to the client.   YES   NO   N/A

4. Smiles when he makes a humorous remark to the client.   YES   NO   N/A

5. Frowns when he states that he does not comprehend what the client is saying.   YES   NO   N/A

6. Frowns when he states his disapproval of something the client has said.   YES   NO   N/A

7. When he looks perplexed by something the client has said, he mentions his confusion to the client. In such situations, he does <u>not</u> nod or say "Um-hum," "I see," "I understand," etc.   YES   NO   N/A

8. Nods when his remarks suggest that he agrees with something the client has said.   YES   NO   N/A

9. Shakes his head from side to side when he states his disagreement with something the client has said.   YES   NO   N/A

10. Tone of voice is compatible with the verbal content of his responses. For example, when he says, "I understand how you feel about this problem,"his voice tone communicates an earnest "I <u>really</u> know how you feel," rather than a business-like "I know how you feel; I've seen many others who felt the same way; now, let's get on with the interview.   YES   NO   N/A

11. When he turns from a "lesser" topic to a more serious one, his tone of voice becomes more concerned.   YES   NO   N/A

12. When he looks shocked or angry, his voice quality mirrors these feelings (e.g., his voice is agitated, louder, etc.).   YES   NO   N/A

13. When his remarks suggest a feeling of greater psychological closeness to the client, he moves physically closer to him.   YES   NO   N/A

14. Gives the overall impression of "being himself"
    in the interview; does not put on a professional
    front or facade; is not a pretender, a phony,
    a "glad-hander," or a "con-man."   YES   NO   N/A

Overall rating on Consistency of Communication between Verbal and Non-Verbal
Behavior: Considering the definition of this dimension and the specific behaviors
observed in the interview, circle a number on the following scale to indicate
your overall rating of the counselor on Consistency of Communication between Verbal
and Non-Verbal Behavior.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Exhibits verbal and non-verbal behaviors which are widely discrepant. Presents an almost uniformly incompatible set of "signals." Seems a complete "phony" in his communication with the client.	Exhibits verbal and non-verbal behaviors which are frequently incompatible. Often gives the impression that he does not mean what he is saying.	Exhibits verbal and non-verbal behaviors which are occasionally out of line with each other. However, his behaviors considered as a whole seem reasonably compatible.	Exhibits verbal and non-verbal behaviors which are nearly always compatible. Sometimes, although seldom, he engages in non-verbal behaviors which suggest that he does not fully mean what he is saying.	Shows no discernible discrepancy between verbal and non-verbal behaviors. Exhibits facial expressions, eye movements, voice quality, gestures, etc., that are uniformly compatible with his verbalizations.

Scale No. 4: <u>Perceptual Sensitivity</u>

Part of the counselor's task is to listen and comprehend what the client is communicating. Client communications vary from overt, simple verbal expressions to very subtle non-verbal communications which are expressed through changes in voice quality, facial expression, gestures, nervous mannerisms, and the like.

<u>Observation of Specific Behaviors</u>: The following are some of the behaviors from which Perceptual Sensitivity may be inferred. For <u>each</u> behavior:
    Circle "YES" if the behavior occurred in this interview.
    Circle "NO" if the behavior should have occurred in this interview but did not.
    Circle "N/A" (for "Not Applicable") if the behavior failed to occur because
       it was irrelevant to this interview.

1.	Listens carefully to what the client is saying.	YES	NO	N/A
2.	Remembers details of what the client has said, rather than having to be corrected or refreshed on such matters later in the interview.	YES	NO	N/A
3.	Behaves in a manner apparently consistent with the client's mood (e.g., smiles when the client smiles, etc.).	YES	NO	N/A
4.	Apparently tries to see things from the client's point of view.	YES	NO	N/A
5.	Appears alert to the feelings which are expressed in the client's remarks.	YES	NO	N/A
6.	Makes statements apparently intended to convey his understanding of the client's feelings (or, states that he understands how the client feels).	YES	NO	N/A
7.	Suggests how the client feels about an event which he (the client) has mentioned.	YES	NO	N/A
8.	Seems able to perceive and sort out ambivalent and conflicting feelings on the part of the client.	YES	NO	N/A
9.	Responds to negative as well as positive feelings of the client; does not "move away" from negative feelings.	YES	NO	N/A
10.	Seems alert to problems or difficulties other than the one first mentioned by the client.	YES	NO	N/A
11.	Follows abrupt client shifts in topic and seems able to tie these into a common thread or theme.	YES	NO	N/A
12.	Usually responds to the "core" of a long, confused, or ambivalent client statement.	YES	NO	N/A
13.	Responds to subtle cues regarding client attitudes, goals, etc.	YES	NO	N/A
14.	Apparently perceives non-verbal cues on the part of the client, such as posture, tone of voice, and facial expression.	YES	NO	N/A

Part of the counselor's task is to listen and comprehend what the client is communicating. Client communications vary from overt, simple verbal expressions to very subtle non-verbal communications which are expressed through changes in voice quality, facial expression, gestures, nervous mannerisms, and the like.

<u>Observation of Specific Behaviors</u>: The following are some of the behaviors from which Perceptual Sensitivity may be inferred. For <u>each</u> behavior:
    Circle "YES" if the behavior occurred in this interview.
    Circle "NO" if the behavior should have occurred in this interview but did not.
    Circle "N/A" (for "Not Applicable") if the behavior failed to occur because it was irrelevant to this interview.

1. Listens carefully to what the client is saying.   YES NO N/A

2. Remembers details of what the client has said, rather than having to be corrected or refreshed on such matters later in the interview.   YES NO N/A

3. Behaves in a manner apparently consistent with the client's mood (e.g., smiles when the client smiles, etc.).   YES NO N/A

4. Apparently tries to see things from the client's point of view.   YES NO N/A

5. Appears alert to the feelings which are expressed in the client's remarks.   YES NO N/A

6. Makes statements apparently intended to convey his understanding of the client's feelings (or, states that he understands how the client feels).   YES NO N/A

7. Suggests how the client feels about an event which he (the client) has mentioned.   YES NO N/A

8. Seems able to perceive and sort out ambivalent and conflicting feelings on the part of the client.   YES NO N/A

9. Responds to negative as well as positive feelings of the client; does not "move away" from negative feelings.   YES NO N/A

10. Seems alert to problems or difficulties other than the one first mentioned by the client.   YES NO N/A

11. Follows abrupt client shifts in topic and seems able to tie these into a common thread or theme.   YES NO N/A

12. Usually responds to the "core" of a long, confused, or ambivalent client statement.   YES NO N/A

13. Responds to subtle cues regarding client attitudes, goals, etc.   YES NO N/A

14. Apparently perceives non-verbal cues on the part of the client, such as posture, tone of voice, and facial expression.   YES NO N/A

15. Calls attention to the client's facial expression.   YES NO N/A

16. Breaks silences when the client seems painfully ill at ease.   YES NO N/A

17. Phrases summaries or interpretations in tentative ways, inviting client "feedback."   YES NO N/A

18. Times his interpretations appropriately; avoids premature, defense-arousing interpretations.   YES NO N/A

19. Uses a level of vocabulary (word difficulty)
    similar to that of the client.   YES   NO   N/A

20. Uses the "lingo" of the client. For example, if the client
    uses the term "Mac" for Macalester College, the
    counselor also uses "Mac". Or, if the client speaks
    of being "on cloud nine," the counselor responds with
    something like "When you're on cloud nine . . ."   YES   NO   N/A

21. Supplies a key word or phrase for which the client is
    unsuccessfully groping.   YES   NO   N/A

22. When the client appears bored, unconcerned, or
    otherwise "resistant" in the interview, the
    counselor discusses this with him.   YES   NO   N/A

Overall Rating on Perceptual Sensitivity: Considering the definition of this
dimension and the specific behaviors observed in the interview, circle a number
on the following scale to indicate your overall rating of the counselor on
Perceptual Sensitivity.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

Hardly ever receives overt client communications, and never receives the subtle ones.	Receives some of the overt client communications, but none of the subtle ones.	Receives most of the overt communications, of the client, and a few of the subtle ones.	Receives all of the overt client communications, and most of the subtle ones.	Receives all of the overt communications of the client, and all or nearly all of the subtle ones.

Scale No. 5: Involvement with Client

One of the counselor's assets is his ability to enter into a close, spontaneous relationship with the client. There are two main aspects to this dimension of counseling: (a) the extent to which the counselor shows a genuine feeling of acceptance and caring for the client, and (b) the extent to which the counselor reveals himself frankly and openly as one human being to another.

Observation of Specific Behaviors: The following are some of the behaviors from which Involvement with Client may be inferred. For each behavior:

> Circle "YES" if the behavior occurred in this interview.
> Circle "NO" if the behavior should have occurred in this interview but did not.
> Circle "N/A" (for "Not Applicable") if the behavior failed to occur because it was irrelevant to this interview.

1.	Uses the client's first name.	YES	NO	N/A
2.	Usually looks at the client.	YES	NO	N/A
3.	Focuses his attention on the client, rather than appearing detached, disinterested, or preoccupied.	YES	NO	N/A
4.	Has an open and receptive facial expression.	YES	NO	N/A
5.	Has a pleasant manner.	YES	NO	N/A
6.	Has an animated, overtly responsive manner in the interview; not "deadpan."	YES	NO	N/A
7.	Seems at ease with the client; has a relaxed posture; does not appear tense or exhibit nervous mannerisms.	YES	NO	N/A
8.	Smiles as an expression of cordiality toward the client.	YES	NO	N/A
9.	Smiles when the client makes a humorous remark.	YES	NO	N/A
10.	Leans toward the client apparently as an expression of interest.	YES	NO	N/A
11.	Makes casual physical contact with the client as an expression of affection.	YES	NO	N/A
12.	Shows consideration for the client's physical comfort (e.g., asks whether client is physically comfortable, offers a more comfortable chair, adjusts window for client's comfort, hangs up client's coat, etc.).	YES	NO	N/A
13.	Offers the client a piece of candy or gum or other favor.	YES	NO	N/A
14.	Expresses his willingness to help the client if it is possible.	YES	NO	N/A
15.	Talks enthusiastically about the client's hobbies

relationship with the client. There are two main aspects to this dimension of counseling: (a) the extent to which the counselor shows a genuine feeling of acceptance and caring for the client, and (b) the extent to which the counselor reveals himself frankly and openly as one human being to another.

Observation of Specific Behaviors: The following are some of the behaviors from which Involvement with Client may be inferred. For each behavior:

> Circle "YES" if the behavior occurred in this interview.
> Circle "NO" if the behavior should have occurred in this intervi ut did not.
> Circle "N/A" (for "Not Applicable") if the behavior failed to occur because it was irrelevant to this interview.

1.	Uses the client's first name.	YES	NO	N/A
2.	Usually looks at the client.	YES	NO	N/A
3.	Focuses his attention on the client, rather than appearing detached, disinterested, or preoccupied.	YES	NO	N/A
4.	Has an open and receptive facial expression.	YES	NO	N/A
5.	Has a pleasant manner.	YES	NO	N/A
6.	Has an animated, overtly responsive manner in the interview; not "deadpan."	YES	NO	N/A
7.	Seems at ease with the client; has a relaxed posture; does not appear tense or exhibit nervous mannerisms.	YES	NO	N/A
8.	Smiles as an expression of cordiality toward the client.	YES	NO	N/A
9.	Smiles when the client makes a humorous remark.	YES	NO	N/A
10.	Leans toward the client apparently as an expression of interest.	YES	NO	N/A
11.	Makes casual physical contact with the client as an expression of affection.	YES	NO	N/A
12.	Shows consideration for the client's physical comfort (e.g., asks whether client is physically comfortable, offers a more comfortable chair, adjusts window for client's comfort, hangs up client's coat, etc.).	YES	NO	N/A
13.	Offers the client a piece of candy or gum or other favor.	YES	NO	N/A
14.	Expresses his willingness to help the client if it is possible.	YES	NO	N/A
15.	Talks enthusiastically about the client's hobbies or special interests.	YES	NO	N/A
16.	Asks the client how he feels about being interviewed.	YES	NO	N/A
17.	Asks how the client feels toward him.	YES	NO	N/A
18.	Discusses the feelings which the client has toward him.	YES	NO	N/A

19. When the client directs negative feelings toward him, the counselor invites a frank discussion of these feelings.   YES   NO   N/A

20. Tells the client how he feels toward him.   YES   NO   N/A

21. Verbally expresses his sympathy for the client.. YES   NO   N/A

22. Deals directly and openly with a client request to know his opinion, value, attitude or feeling.   YES   NO   N/A

23. When a client statement obviously challenges one of the counselor's cherished values, he talks about this with the client.   YES   NO   N/A

24. Voluntarily states his opinion or feeling about something the client has said.   YES   NO   N/A

25. Talks about himself in the interview (his own experiences, attitudes, values, interests, etc.) in response to a client need.   YES   NO   N/A

26. Makes statements critical of himself to the client. YES   NO   N/A

Overall Rating on Involvement with Client: Considering the definition of this dimension and the specific behaviors observed in the interview, circle a number on the following scale to indicate your overall rating of the counselor on Involvement with Client.

```
      1       2       3       4       5       6       7       8       9
      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____
```

Gives no evidence of genuine acceptance or caring for the client. Almost uniformly distant, guarded, and overly "professional" in manner.	Usually quite remote in the relationship, although there are a few indications that he would like to get "closer" to the client.	Usually communicates his acceptance and caring for the client, but at times seems somewhat distant and impersonal. Shares himself openly with the client on some occasions, but at other times tries to appear neutral or noncommittal.	Communicates his acceptance and caring for the client at all times. Shows some reluctance to share his personal feelings, attitudes, or opinions in response to a client need.	Communicates his acceptance and caring for the client at all times. Reveals himself quite frankly and openly in response to a client need.

Rater_____

Counselor_____

Date_____

Overall Rating of the Interview: Please circle a number on the following scale
to indicate your general impression of the interview. Make this evaluation after
performing the ratings on the five dimensions.


```
        1       2       3       4       5       6       7       8       9
        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____

      Very          Weak            Fair            Good            Excellent
      Poor
```

SUMMARY

Two types of counseling practicum programs were compared using a population of thirty counselors-in-training. Two groups of fifteen counselors each were randomly assigned to the two practicum treatments. Group A received a traditional type of counseling practicum consisting of sixty hours of supervised counseling experience concentrated into the final three months of a one year preparation program. Group B received the same number of hours distributed over a six month period. Supervising staff and methods of instruction were identical for the two groups.

Training outcomes of the two treatments were measured using a set of rating scales developed to measure five theoretically relevant constructs of counseling process as well as overall performance in the interview. These scales were found to be usable with interjudge reliabilities on the order of .90; predictive validities for predicting practicum grade from pre-practicum interviews were on the order of .60.

These rating scales were used to evaluate sixteen m.m. sound motion picture films of counseling interviews done on completion of practicum treatments by both groups.

One way analysis of variance tests on all five constructs and overall interview performance scores were run for the total group of thirty counselors. No treatment differences were found between groups on any of the variables. It was not possible to reject the null hypothesis. The distributed treatment group performed as well on these measures as did the concentrated group.

A second phase of the study involved the analysis of the non-verbal interview behavior of counselors. Seventeen categories of such behavior were defined and tallied. Ten of these categories were found to discriminate significantly between high and low rated counselors. Findings suggested that high rated counselors were physically more animated while low rated counselors tended to be passive and rigid in terms of gross body movements and to nod and smile to a greater extent than high rated counselors.